

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/702,548	SUGIMURA, NAOZUMI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas D. Alunkal	2627	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Thomas D. Alunkal. (3) Leonid D. Thenor.
 (2) Dwayne Bost. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 June 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 6,937,553.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Thomas Alunkal

Dwayne Bost

DWAYNE BOST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant generally described the context of the invention to clarify any misunderstanding the Office possibly had. Discussion about the cited prior art in the Final Rejection dated 3/2/07. Agreement was made regarding its relevance. Agreement was made regarding "recording medium identity information, a first content, and a second content" as recited in claim 1. Namely, it was agreed upon that these features needed to be further described in order to make a proper distinction between their meanings. Certain suggestions were also given to Mr. Thenor regarding how to further describe these features. These suggestions included clarifying that first content corresponds to copyrighted content while second content corresponds to bonus content.